

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) For Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues For Electric Service in 2003, And to Reflect That Increase in Rates.

Application 02-05-004  
(Filed May 3, 2002)

Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Southern California Edison Company.

Investigation 02-06-002  
(Filed June 6, 2002)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING  
REQUESTING DATA**

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) introduced certain statements at the final oral argument on February 25, 2004 that warrant clarification and citations to the record so that the Commission's deliberations are appropriately informed. Therefore,

**IT IS RULED** that Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is directed to respond to the data request attached hereto not later than March 5, 2004. SCE shall serve a copy of its response on parties of record.

Dated March 3, 2004, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARK S. WETZELL

Mark S. Wetzell  
Administrative Law Judge

**ATTACHMENT**  
**Page 1**

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S DATA REQUEST TO SCE**

SCE's Chief Executive Officer made the following statement in final oral argument:

"And in response to Commissioner Wood's order that ordered the utility and other parties to address additional focuses for maintenance and other expenses, we identified another \$20 million in [Transmission and Distribution (T&D)] expenses. We identified \$29 million overall in this request. [¶] We didn't ask for an increase in the GRC amount at that time because we would have had to restart the clock, renotice. Subsequent changes in the sales forecasts and other things have created the room that this part could be taken into account. And, in fact, we asked for that to be done in the case." (Tr. V. 48, p. 4580.)

1. Please state whether the foregoing quotation is a true and correct transcription. If not, please provide proposed transcript corrections.
2. Please state whether SCE's statement that it "identified another \$20 million in T&D expenses" refers to the \$20.5 million in increased maintenance expenses shown in Table III-8 at p. 29 of Exhibit 73. If not, please state whether SCE's testimony identified the \$20 million in T&D expenses, and provide citations to the record as applicable.
3. Please clarify SCE's statement it "identified \$29 million overall in this request." What does "this request" refer to? Is the \$20 million (or \$20.5 million) in T&D expenses referenced above included within the \$29 million? Please state whether SCE's testimony identified the \$29 million or the components that total to \$29 million, and provide citations to the record as applicable.

**ATTACHMENT**

**Page 2**

4. Please state whether SCE's statement that it "didn't ask for an increase in the GRC amount at that time" refers, in whole or in part, to SCE's testimony at page 28 of Exhibit 73, where SCE states that it "is not proposing to increase the GRC revenue requirement to fund this additional work." If the statement refers to other testimony, please provide citations to the record.
5. Please state whether SCE's statement that it "didn't ask for an increase in the GRC amount at that time because we would have had to restart the clock, [and] renotice" is supported by SCE's testimony. Please provide citations to the record as applicable.
6. Please clarify SCE's statement that "[s]ubsequent changes in the sales forecasts and other things have created the room that this part could be taken into account." By "subsequent changes in the sales forecast" is SCE referring to its stipulation to ORA's sales forecast? If not, what is SCE referring to? What does "and other things" refer to? What does "this part" refer to? Is SCE's contention that there is "room" to take into account "this part" supported by SCE's testimony? Please provide citations to the record as applicable.
7. Please state whether SCE's statement that "in fact, we asked for that to be done in the case" is supported by SCE's testimony. Please provide citations to the record as applicable.
8. Please state whether the \$20 million (or \$20.5 million) in T&D expenses and the \$29 million overall, referenced above, are included within the 2003 revenue requirement of \$2.992 billion that SCE requests the Commission adopt at p. 2 of SCE's May 9, 2003 Update Testimony, Volume I (Exhibit 411).

**(END OF ATTACHMENT)**

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Requesting Data on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record. In addition, service was also performed by electronic mail.

Dated March 3, 2004, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ FANNIE SID

Fannie Sid

## **N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.